City of Canada Bay
Local Strategic Planning Statement
Community Engagement Report
This report summarises the wide-ranging community and stakeholder engagement program undertaken to inform the City of Canada Bay Council’s Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS), the first stage of the broader engagement program for the the 2020 Local Environmental Plan Review (LEP Review).

Council engaged Place Design Group as lead engagement consultants for this project, conducting community engagement and research, and engagement with internal stakeholders.

As part of the LEP Review project, Council also engaged seven consultancy teams to undertake reviews in a range of technical areas.

The focus areas are:

- housing
- employment and productivity
- movement
- social/community infrastructure
- open space and recreation
- urban tree canopy
- biodiversity.

These consultants have undertaken key stakeholder engagement activities as a critical component of their studies.

The findings featured within this report will guide the development of the draft LSPS, and further actions as directed by the new planning framework, and the Greater Sydney Commission’s Eastern City District Plan.
1.1 Project objectives

The purpose of the lead engagement consultancy project was to deliver a community engagement program to assist in informing Council’s LEP Review and draft LSPS.

In addition to conducting community engagement, this involved aligning the outputs of consultants working across related focus areas.

Through collaboration, a single set of refined and tested insights were developed to assist Council in its important future strategic planning tasks.

The key objectives for the lead engagement project were:

- to gather, refine and distil insights from technical specialists and key internal and external stakeholders and develop a reliable and tested suite of insights to guide Council in its preparation of a draft LSPS
- to avoid engagement overlap and fatigue by building on the previously completed Your Future 2030 engagement process, and carefully planning engagement activities conducted by various consultants
- to facilitate an open and well-publicised engagement process where the community are given multiple, meaningful opportunities to have their say across a variety of methods
- to provide accessible opportunities for community participation, acknowledging and meeting the diverse and changing needs of the Canada Bay community.
A range of internal, key stakeholder and community engagement methods and activities have created a strong evidence base for Council’s LEP Review.

2.1 POP-UP ENGAGEMENT EVENTS
Pop-up consultation events with Place Design Group representatives were hosted at two key locations.

Friday 22 February 2019
» 4pm – 6pm, Union Square, Rhodes

Saturday 23 February 2019
» 9:30am – 11:30am, Fred Kelly Place, Five Dock

The pop-ups included a mix of interactive methods, including:
» iPads with online survey available
» giant Connect 4 game to allow voting on key priority areas
» idea banners focused on key LSPS considerations including character, local centres and movement.

While wet weather was a challenge during the pop-up in Rhodes, across these two events, 400 bi-lingual promotional postcards were distributed, and many members of the community took the opportunity to have in-depth conversations with the project team.

In addition to these successful pop-up stalls, Place Design Group prepared a day-long consultation stall at the Council-run Concord Carnival event on Sunday 17 March 2019. Unfortunately, due to extreme weather conditions, this event was cancelled.

2.2 ONLINE SURVEY
An online survey hosted on Place Design Group’s engagement platform, Frank Chats was used to gather and distil key insights on a comprehensive range of issues.

The online survey was live for five weeks, from Friday 15 February to Friday 22 March.

The survey link was hosted on the City of Canada Bay’s website and was promoted online via social media posts. Also used to promote the online survey were newsletter articles placed in Council’s advertorial page within the Inner West Courier newspaper.

A printed postcard highlighting key project messaging and the online survey was delivered to the entire LGA.
Have your SAY on the future character of your neighbourhood and local centres to inform our local planning statement.

What do you like about your neighbourhood?

Have your SAY

Help shape the character of your neighbourhood and local centres.

As Canada Bay changes, what would you like to see in your local centre?

- Breaksfast cafes and pubs
- Community activities
- Cycle infrastructure
- Gym
- Technology for electric vehicle charging

Have your SAY
2.3 KEY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The project teams completing technical reviews as part of the LEP Review conducted engagement with key local, industry and government stakeholders relevant to their focus area. This engagement occurred from December 2018 – February 2019, with methods including phone and face-to-face meetings, focus groups, questionnaires and online surveys.

This engagement had a strong technical focus and formed an important part of building an evidence base and ground truthing the strategies and directions of the District Plan.

2.4 INTERNAL ENGAGEMENT

A series of internal workshops were conducted throughout the project (and are ongoing). Two Councillor workshops were held, as well as two ‘Collaborative Consultancies’ sessions with focus area consultants and strategic planning staff from Council.

The Councillor workshops sought to gain early project buy-in, and through workshop activities, the key priorities of Councillors based on early work from the focus area consultants emerged. The Councillors also received more detailed presentations from focus area consultants to afford them the opportunity to provide input and ask questions.

The collaborative consultancies workshops brought together key Council staff, Place Design Group and project teams from the seven focus area review projects. The purpose of these workshops was to bring together the evidence-base and align draft visions and priorities under the themes and directions of the LSPS.
The online survey was comprehensive, covering key issues relating to the preparation of Canada Bay’s LSPS, including:

» local centres and employment
» housing growth, neighbourhoods and character
» key trade-off issues
» movement and transport
» community facilities
» recreation and open space, including the Canada Bay foreshore
» tree canopy cover
» biodiversity.

There were 384 valid responses received to this survey, which was open from 15 February until 22 March 2019.

Due to the comprehensive nature of the project and survey, the average completion time was 20 minutes. Given the substantial average length of time to complete the survey, the number of responses received is a testament to the level of engagement of the Canada Bay community in the future of their community.

The following data, infographics and graphs represent a summary of the key themes and findings of this round of community engagement (pre-LSPS exhibition), including the Frank Chats online survey and sentiment received through the in-person pop-up events.

### DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Speak a language other than English at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather not say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The online survey was comprehensive, covering key issues relating to the preparation of Canada Bay’s LSPS, including:

- local centres and employment
- housing growth, neighbourhoods and character
- key trade-off issues
- movement and transport
- community facilities
- recreation and open space, including the Canada Bay foreshore
- tree canopy cover
- biodiversity.

There were 384 valid responses received to this survey, which was open from 15 February until 22 March 2019.

Due to the comprehensive nature of the project and survey, the average completion time was 20 minutes. Given the substantial average length of time to complete the survey, the number of responses received is a testament to the level of engagement of the Canada Bay community in the future of their community.
The Canada Bay community at large

Key Findings:
When asked what they feel defines the Canada Bay area and what makes it special, residents said:

» Canada Bay is a green and leafy community with access to parks, open spaces and the foreshore.
» Canada Bay has a village feel, with a strong sense of community and feeling of safety.
» Canada Bay has many beautiful character homes which define the area and should be protected. New housing and density must reflect this character.
» Canada Bay is ideally located, close to central Sydney with local services and amenity in close proximity.

As Canada Bay changes, what would you like to see in your local centre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>More of this</th>
<th>The same</th>
<th>Less of this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches/ table and public art</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parks</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (wi-fi charges etc)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and activities</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafes and restaurants</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and trades</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged care/ retirement facilities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential terrace housing</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space/ co-working spaces</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential apartments</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is it about your local area that defines it and make it special to you?

As Canada Bay changes, what would you like to see in your neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>More of this</th>
<th>The same amount</th>
<th>Less of this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street trees</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services/ facilities</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged care/ retirement facilities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing options</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment and productivity

Key Findings:

» Overall, local residents have a positive impression of their local centres

» Five Dock, Concord, Drummoyne, Rhodes and Strathfield were the top 5 centres mentioned
   » Five Dock – seen as friendly, convenient, village, community
   » Concord – seen as village, friendly, busy, pleasant
   » Drummoyne – seen as busy, friendly, noisy, convenient
   » Rhodes – seen as busy, accessible, clean, crowded
   » North Strathfield – seen as friendly, accessible, (high) traffic, green

» Sentiment towards the Drummoyne centre was noticeably more negative than the other centres, with words such as ‘disjointed’, ‘sad’, ‘dirty’ and ‘unloved’ coming through along with more positive words

» Residents use centres for shopping, to have a coffee, access services and to visit bars/restaurants to catch up with friends and family

» 42% strongly agree that it is important to be able to access urban services (car repairs, home improvement) close to home

» 40% say that if they could work remotely, they would largely work from home only, however there was still support for working from co-working spaces, and in tech-enabled public spaces and cafes

Insights

There were varying levels of local use versus broader use in these top centres. By this we mean the amount of traffic in a local centre based on the suburb of origin. 48% of those who nominated the Five Dock centre live in Five Dock.

Local use in other top local centres:
- 65% - Concord
- 83% - Drummoyne
- 55% - Rhodes
- 94% - North Strathfield

How long would it take you to walk to your nearest local centre?

Under 5 mins: 26%  
5-10 mins: 37%  
10-20 mins: 28%  
>20 mins: 10%

Top five local centres named by respondents

- Five Dock: 21%
- Concord: 20%
- Drummoyne: 16%
- Rhodes: 13%
- N. Strathfield: 9%
### What words would you use to describe the character of your local centre?

- Vibrant
- Convenient
- Friendly
- Busy
- Village
- Safe
- Multi-cultural
- Clean
- Handy
- Crowded
- Pleasant
- Small
- Care
- Accessible
- Traffic
- Good
- Parking
- Quiet
- Shopping
- Orientate
- Good
- Coast
- Cosmopolitan

### What improvements could be made to assist with access to your local centres?

- Car parking
- More trees/shade
- Better street furniture
- More or improved footpaths
- Bike paths
- Better lighting
- Bike parking
- Better signage
- No improvements needed

**Percentage Distribution:**

- Car parking: 46%
- More trees/shade: 44%
- Better street furniture: 37%
- More or improved footpaths: 32%
- Bike paths: 25%
- Better lighting: 21%
- Bike parking: 20%
- Better signage: 13%
- No improvements needed: 9%

### What do you do in your local centre?

- Shopping: 95%
- Have coffee: 68%
- Access services (post office etc.): 67%
- Medical services: 54%
- Bars/restaurants: 51%
- Catch up with friends/family: 51%
- Beauty/personal services: 31%
- Access community facilities: 30%
- Other: 9%
- Work: 6%

**Percentage Distribution:**

- Shopping: 95%
- Have coffee: 68%
- Access services (post office etc.): 67%
- Medical services: 54%
- Bars/restaurants: 51%
- Catch up with friends/family: 51%
- Beauty/personal services: 31%
- Access community facilities: 30%
- Other: 9%
- Work: 6%
Housing

Key Findings:

» Additional apartments not favoured in local centres - 64% of respondents want fewer apartments

» Stronger agreement levels (around 70%) for new dwellings around current and proposed public transport hubs/future Metro stations

» 72% strongly agree with the statement that more housing equates more traffic

» 76% strongly agree that new development should reflect surrounding character

» 69% favour maintaining low density areas versus 31% for improved housing options and affordability - similar result among sample of current apartment occupants

New dwellings should be....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surrounding current and proposed future public transport hubs</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located around transport corridors such as Metro West stations</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distributed evenly across the whole council area (infill/terraces)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focused in govt development precincts (eg. Parramatta Rd)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focused in larger existing centres, such as Rhodes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located around existing suburban centres (local shopping strips)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree
Insights
Support for maintaining low density areas was higher in Drummoyne (80%) and Concord (73%), while support for improved housing options and affordability was stronger in North Strathfield (43%) than the LGA average of 31%.
There was also a clear correlation between age and support for a particular option, with higher support for improved options and affordability among younger respondents.
However, a majority of survey respondents supported maintaining low density areas across all age groups.

Please rate your level of agreement with the below statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New development should contribute to greening of area</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development should reflect character of surrounding area</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing means more traffic on our roads</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many developments don’t fit in with surrounding homes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to access urban services (eg. car repairs) locally</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should only build new homes/apartments near PT</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New housing could be provided in place of office/industrial areas</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Movement

Key Findings:

» More frequent services the top factor to encourage public transport use
» More trees, footpaths and lighting, and safer crossings key factors to improve walkability
» Dedicated bike paths top factor to encourage local cycling
» There is overwhelming sentiment that walkability is highly valued
» 60% support dedicated lanes for bikes and public transport, while 40% prefer maintained road widths/number of lanes

» There is greater support for bike/PT lanes among under-54 demographic
» Car parking is still desired in local centres (62% want to see more) – however 61% would trade off more car parking for wider footpaths
» Over 60% agree that we need to reduce car reliance
» 63% agree that it is difficult to travel east and west across the area

What would encourage you to catch public transport?

- More frequent services: 74%
- Better transport to local centre: 43%
- Park ‘n’ ride facilities: 34%
- More stations/stops: 32%
- Better footpaths/connections: 30%
- Improved roads: 22%
- Other: 16%

What would encourage you to walk more in your local area?

- More trees: 62%
- Safer road crossings: 51%
- More footpaths: 49%
- Lighting: 48%
- Better connections: 29%
- Other: 18%
- Better signage: 14%

What would encourage you to cycle more in your local area?

- Dedicated bike paths: 71%
- Better connections: 30%
- End of trip facilities: 27%
- Other: 25%
- Better signage: 18%
We need to reduce the need to have our own cars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are enough public transport options in my area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to be able to walk to local shops, cafes and parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is hard to travel east and west across our area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insights

When you wash these findings against other survey findings regarding cycling preferences, the community have indicated that those areas of the LGA with major/main roads running through them are most preferred to have dedicated bike paths. Feedback from the pop up events and via other survey results suggests that it’s not easy to ride on local streets that don’t cater to safer cycling via the inclusion of dedicated cycle paths. This is demonstrated particularly for Drummoyne, North Strathfield and Five Dock as the top three areas in the LGA.
Social infrastructure

Key Findings:

» Libraries are the most utilised Council community service/facility, and have the highest satisfaction rate (92%), followed by halls/function centres, and childcare centres

» Generally high levels of satisfaction for Council’s community facilities and programs among those who have used them

» 43% of all respondents want a library closer to them – this rises to 64% among respondents in Drummoyne

Which of the following services and facilities have you ever used in the City of Canada Bay?

- Council libraries: 87%
- Community halls/function centre: 52%
- Early childhood education/care: 40%
- Council health services: 26%
- Other Council facilities/services: 15%
- Council youth programs: 15%
- Council OSHC: 12%
- Programs for older persons: 8%
- Council aged care services: 4%
- CALD programs: 4%
How would you rate your level of satisfaction with these services?

NOTE: Options only displayed to those who said they have used the particular service. Data for services only used by a smaller percentage of the community has a lower sample size and should be used carefully.

Which of the below services and facilities do you feel should be located closer to you?

- Council libraries: 50% Extremely satisfied, 42% Somewhat satisfied, 4% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% Somewhat dissatisfied, 1% Extremely dissatisfied
- Early childhood education/care: 38% Extremely satisfied, 42% Somewhat satisfied, 16% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% Somewhat dissatisfied, 1% Extremely dissatisfied
- Council OSHC: 34% Extremely satisfied, 44% Somewhat satisfied, 15% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% Somewhat dissatisfied, 5% Extremely dissatisfied
- Council youth programs: 27% Extremely satisfied, 41% Somewhat satisfied, 24% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% Somewhat dissatisfied, 6% Extremely dissatisfied
- Community halls/function centre: 22% Extremely satisfied, 54% Somewhat satisfied, 22% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% Somewhat dissatisfied, 6% Extremely dissatisfied
- Council health services: 18% Extremely satisfied, 50% Somewhat satisfied, 29% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4% Somewhat dissatisfied, 4% Extremely dissatisfied
- CALD programs: 17% Extremely satisfied, 87% Somewhat satisfied, 17% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4% Somewhat dissatisfied, 4% Extremely dissatisfied
- Programs for older persons: 12% Extremely satisfied, 42% Somewhat satisfied, 31% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 12% Somewhat dissatisfied, 4% Extremely dissatisfied
- Council aged care services: 7% Extremely satisfied, 57% Somewhat satisfied, 21% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 14% Somewhat dissatisfied, 14% Extremely dissatisfied

Which of the below services and facilities do you feel should be located closer to you?

- Council libraries: 43%
- Programs for older persons: 28%
- Council health services: 23%
- Community halls/function centre: 21%
- Council youth programs: 19%
- Council aged care services: 18%
- Early childhood education/care: 18%
- Other Council facilities: 12%
- CALD programs: 11%
- Council OSHC: 11%
Open space and recreation

Key Findings:

» 78% of respondents access local parks and greenspaces once a week or more
» Around three-quarters of trips to local parks are by active transport (walking and cycling)
» Active, unstructured recreation (especially walking and running), enjoying scenery and using playgrounds are the top activities at parks
» In a forced choice question, 79% preferred open, natural spaces to more fields for organised sport and recreation (21%)
» 90% favour public access to the waterfront over privacy for waterfront property owners (10%)
» Over two-thirds access the foreshore once a week or more, with Taplin Park and Brett Park the most favoured locations
» The most popular parks were Cabarita Park, Five Dock Park, Sydney Olympic Park (including Bicentennial Park) and the foreshore and Bay Run more broadly

How often do you use parks/greenspace in the City of Canada Bay area?

- Every day: 21%
- A few times per week: 42%
- Once a week: 15%
- A few times per month: 10%
- Once a month: 5%
- Very rarely/never: 8%

How do you normally access parks/green space within the City of Canada Bay?

- Walking: 22%
- Car: 11%
- Cycle: 11%
- Public transport: 2%
- eScooter/eBikes: 1%
- Taxi/rideshare: 0%

What do you do there?

- Go for a walk/run: 46%
- Enjoy scenery: 26%
- Walk the dog: 26%
- Meet friends: 18%
- Sit and have a coffee: 18%
- Socialise: 16%
- Casual sport/turn up & play: 15%
- Other: 14%
- Picnic/BBQ: 13%
- Participate in organised sport: 12%
- Attend events: 7%

Insights

Results indicate that nearly three quarters of respondents are accessing public parks by active transport (not including ebikes and e-scooter which is less than one percent). This means that they are three times more likely to access public spaces across the LGA via active transport. Walking again strongly dominates this, followed by car and cycling.

Insights

Organised sport came through as one of the least valued options among respondents, with walking/running again dominating the preference pool indicating additional favour for active recreational activities across the LGA. In addition to the preference of active recreation over organised sport, playgrounds and things to do with kids close by also ranked highly here and across other free text options from survey respondents. This could indicate a possible appetite for more, smaller public spaces with smaller detail (take Millers Point Parks as great examples of this) to create additional public spaces closer to family homes.
TRADE OFF QUESTIONS: WHICH IS YOUR PREFERRED OPTION?

Open spaces vs. fields for organised sport

- **Open spaces and natural habitats**: 79%
- **More fields to support organised sport and recreation**: 21%

Public waterfront use vs. private property ownership

- **Public access to the waterfront**: 90%
- **Privacy for waterfront property owners**: 10%
Insights
According to respondents, Taplin Park is the most accessed hotspot on the LGA’s foreshore. Brett Park on the eastern side of Drummoyne also ranked highly, but perhaps this is also due to the presence of organised rowing and swimming clubs there, and other centres/dining options to recreate. Breakfast Point and Cabarita are the third and fourth most popular access points mentioned.
How often do you access the foreshore?

- Every day: 38%
- A few times per week: 17%
- Once a week: 13%
- A few times per month: 10%
- Once a month: 9%
- Very rarely/never: 1%

Insights
For an LGA that has the unique asset of a large degree of foreshore, it is not surprising that over 50% of respondents claimed they access the foreshore more than once a week. The exceptions being Concord, Concord West and North Strathfield who access it the least (which is not surprising given their locations).

What improvements would make you visit other foreshore sites?

- More trees/shade: 61%
- Footpaths: 41%
- Seats: 41%
- Better connections: 40%
- Cycle tracks: 32%
- Car parking: 27%
- Picnic shelters/BBQ: 23%
- Playgrounds: 16%
- Interpretive info/wayfinding: 16%
- Stairs or ramps: 12%

Key Findings:

» Trees highly valued by respondents
» Three-quarters want more trees in their local centre and neighbourhood
» Trees considered most important factor to increase local walking
» More trees favoured in parks, along major roads and in centres (80% support and higher)
» Despite this, only 30% favour more trees on their own property

Where would you like to see more trees in your neighbourhood?

- Parks: 43% Many more trees, 41% Some more trees, 16% Same amount of trees
- On major roads: 41% Many more trees, 37% Some more trees, 22% Same amount of trees
- My local centre: 35% Many more trees, 45% Some more trees, 20% Same amount of trees
- Local shopping strips: 34% Many more trees, 46% Some more trees, 20% Same amount of trees
- Along my street: 34% Many more trees, 30% Some more trees, 36% Same amount of trees
- On my property: 11% Many more trees, 19% Some more trees, 69% Same amount of trees
Biodiversity

Key Findings:
Top ranked biodiversity priorities:
» reducing negative impacts from development
» improving water quality of local catchments
» reducing impact of pollution on local biodiversity
» controlling pest animals.

How important to you are the following priorities to improve biodiversity in the City of Canada Bay?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing negative impacts from development on environment</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving water quality of local catchments</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing impact of pollution on local biodiversity</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling pest animals (e.g. foxes and Indian Myna birds)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging community ownership/care for environment</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling weeds in natural areas</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling the impact of dogs and cats</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating wildlife habitat outside Council reserves</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting community Bushcare volunteers</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where to from here?

The findings from this community and stakeholder engagement program will help shape Council’s ongoing LEP Review projects, including the finalisation of the draft LSPS.

This report will also assist focus area consultants in finalising their reports and strategies.

The draft LSPS will be placed on public exhibition later this year, allowing for further community and stakeholder input.

Note: As the broader LEP Review process continues and ongoing engagement occurs, at key milestones this document will evolve and be updated as the project requires.

For more information, visit: canadabay.nsw.gov.au/localplanning
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